

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated November 3, 2006, has been received and carefully considered. In this response, claims 1, 10, and 15 have been amended. Entry of the amendments to claims 1, 10, and 15 is respectfully requested. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is also respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

I. THE ANTICIPATION REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-18

On pages 3-8 of the Office Action, claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kida (U.S. Patent No. 5,877,942). This rejection is hereby respectfully traversed.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Patent Office bears the burden of presenting at least a prima facie case of anticipation. In re Sun, 31 USPQ2d 1451, 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (unpublished). Anticipation requires that a prior art reference disclose, either expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of the claimed invention. Id.. "In addition, the prior art reference must be enabling." Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commission, 808 F.2d 1471, 1479, 1 USPQ2d 1241, 1245 (Fed. Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 482 U.S. 909 (1987). That is, the prior art reference must sufficiently describe the

claimed invention so as to have placed the public in possession of it. In re Donohue, 766 F.2d 531, 533, 226 USPQ 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Such possession is effected only if one of ordinary skill in the art could have combined the disclosure in the prior art reference with his/her own knowledge to make the claimed invention. Id..

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Kida teaches the claimed invention by teaching that a circuit card assembly may be used to emulate an Application Specific Integrated Circuit (ASIC) by fabricating a printed wiring board to provide appropriate interconnection paths. Applicants respectfully disagree. Specifically, Kida fails to teach, any type of method for mapping contacts of a programmable logic device (PLD) to an electronic component in a signal routing device having one or more layers. To clarify this shortcoming of Kida, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that a contact layout of the electronic component is substantially similar to the contact layout of the PLD. Kida certainly fails to teach, or even suggest, this added limitation, in addition to the original limitations of claim 1. At this point it should be noted that, as stated in MPEP § 2131, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art

reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Also, as stated in MPEP § 2112, "In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." Ex parte Levy, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) (emphasis in original). The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Kida fails to teach, or even suggest, the claimed invention as set forth in claim 1. Thus, is it further respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over Kida.

Regarding claims 2-9, these claims are dependent upon independent claim 1. Thus, since independent claim 1 should be allowable as discussed above, claims 2-9 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features which are not disclosed, or even suggested, by the cited references taken either alone or in combination.

Regarding claim 10, this claim recites subject matter related to claim 1. Thus, the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 10. Also, claim 10 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable over Kida for at least the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claims 11-14, these claims are dependent upon independent claim 10. Thus, since independent claim 10 should be allowable as discussed above, claims 11-14 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 10. Moreover, these claims recite additional features which are not disclosed, or even suggested, by the cited references taken either alone or in combination.

Regarding claim 15, this claim recites subject matter related to claim 1. Thus, the arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 15. Also, claim 15 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is allowable over Kida for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claims 16-18, these claims are dependent upon independent claim 15. Thus, since independent claim 15 should

be allowable as discussed above, claims 16-18 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 15. Moreover, these claims recite additional features which are not disclosed, or even suggested, by the cited references taken either alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned anticipation rejection of claims 1-18 be withdrawn.

## II. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0206, and please credit any excess fees

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/728,894  
Attorney Docket No.: 57983.000155  
Client Reference No.: 16117ROUS02I

to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunton & Williams LLP

By: 

Thomas E. Anderson  
Registration No. 37,063

TEA/vrp

Hunton & Williams LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109  
Telephone: (202) 955-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201

Date: September 5, 2007